UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/665,878 | 09/19/2003 | Mikko Sahinoja | KOLS.050PA | 6777 |

76385 7590 05/12/2009

Hollingsworth & Funk, LLC
8009 34th Avenue South
Suite 125
Minneapolis, MN 54425

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| CHEA, PHILIP J | |
| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| 2453 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 05/12/2009 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/665,878 | SAHINOJA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | PHILIP J. CHEA | 2453 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 February 2009*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-8 and 11-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-7 and 10-20* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *3* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *2/24/09*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

## DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to an Amendment filed February 24, 2009. Claims 1-8,11-20 are currently pending, of which claims 13-20 are new. Any rejection not set forth below has been overcome by the current Amendment.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1,6,7,11,12,15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erlenkoetter et al. (US 6,253,254), herein referred to as Erlenkoetter, and further in view of Frank (US 6,754,799).

As per claims 1,6,7,11,12,15,19 Erlenkoetter discloses a system of addressing a management object in a device management system, as claimed, comprising:

retrieving a content of a predetermined data element from information in the management object (see column 6, lines 6-11 and 56-60, *describing the retrieval, i.e. "get operation" of an object attribute (i.e. predetermined data element) from information in the management object*).

Although the system disclosed by Erlenkoetter shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose indexing at least part of the content of said data element [claim 15,19, using running numbering] coding the indexed at least part of the content of said data element using a predetermined coding algorithm,

assigning the indexed at least part of the content of said data element, in coded form, as an identifier for the management object, and

using said identifier to address the management object.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Erlenkoetter, as evidenced by Frank.

In an analogous art, Frank discloses a system for indexing and retrieving objects stored in a cache (see Abstract). Frank further discloses indexing at least part of the content of said data element [claim 15, 19, using running numbering] (see column 8, lines 41-45, *describing how an H-key is generated from a URL*), coding the indexed at least part of the content of said data element using a predetermined coding algorithm (see column 8, lines 47-49, *showing an algorithm including compression to turn the URL into an H-key*),

assigning the indexed at least part of the content of said data element, in coded form, as an identifier for the management object (see column 8, lines 50-53, *describing how the H-key is used to create an index ID for the management object*), and

using said identifier to address the management object (see column 9, lines 12-15, *showing how the index ID is used to find the bucket where the object is located*).

Given the teaching of Frank, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Erlenkoetter by employing an indexing scheme, such as disclosed by Frank, in order to use memory efficiently and still provide easy and fast retrieval of cached objects.

3. Claims 2,8,13,16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erlenkoetter in view of Frank as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Applicants Admitted Prior Art, herein referred to as AAPA.

As per claims 2 and 8, Erlenkoetter discloses adding said identifier as a new entry in management tree maintained in a server device (see column 5, lines 6-9 and 49-56 and column 6, lines 45-64).

Although the system disclosed by Erlenkoetter in view of Frank shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose a SyncML device management protocol and adding the identifier in a client device according to the SyncML device management protocol.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Erlenkoetter in view of Frank, as evidenced by AAPA.

In an analogous art, AAPA discloses the well known use of SyncML device management in order to synchronize [update] a server and client device (see AAPA specification page 1, lines 19-23).

Given the teaching of AAPA, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Erlenkoetter in view of Frank by employing the SyncML device management protocol, such as disclosed by AAPA, in order to provide the client device with chances to update data and allow the client device to select items it wants to update (see AAPA specification page 1, lines 29-35).

As per claims 13,16, AAPA further discloses that the apparatus is configured to operate as a device management server and send device management commands to at least one client device (see AAPA specification page 1, lines 21-23).

As per claims 14,17, AAPA further discloses that the apparatus is configured to operate as a client device in device management and receive device management commands from at least one management server (see AAPA specification page 1, lines 23-27).

4. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erlenkoetter in view of Frank as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Rabii et al. (US 2002/0032691), here referred to as Rabii.

Although the system disclosed by Erlenkoetter in view of Frank shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose that the coding algorithm is a hash algorithm.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Erlenkoetter in view of Frank, as evidenced by Rabii.

In an analogous art, Rabii discloses a way to rename a hierarchical object identifier such as a URL by hashing the identifier into at least two binary numbers (see paragraph 13).

Given the teaching of Rabii, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Erlenkoetter in view of Frank by employing a

hash algorithm, such as disclosed by Rabii, in order to allow object lookups in a predictable, fixed amount of time.

5. Claims 5,18,20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Erlenkoetter in view of Frank as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of WAP Provisioning Content (submitted with Applicants IDS filed September 19, 2003).

As per claims 5,18,20, although the system disclosed by Erlenkoetter in view of Frank shows substantial features of the claimed invention (discussed above), it fails to disclose adding a management object including WAP protocol provisioning settings for a Bootstrap process.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Erlenkoetter in view of Frank, as evidenced by WAP Provisioning Content.

In an analogous art, WAP Provisioning Content discloses provisioning settings for a Bootstrap process (see page 30, 4.6.8 Parameters For BOOTSTRAP characteristics). At the time of the invention, a person having ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the method of claim 1 could be used to add a management object in any environment that may require easily addressable management objects such as including WAP protocol provisioning settings for a Bootstrap process.

### *Allowable Subject Matter*

6. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

### *Response to Arguments*

7. Applicant's arguments filed February 24, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

A) Applicant contends that Erlenkoetter and AAPA would not be combined.

In considering A), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988)and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that adding a feature such as synchronizing would allow a user i.e. client, that is browsing for hyper media objects to access a server more efficiently if user preferences were stored and synchronized by the server.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHILIP J. CHEA whose telephone number is (571)272-3951. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:30-4:00 (1st Friday Off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on 571-272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Philip J Chea
Examiner
Art Unit 2453

/Philip J Chea/
Examiner, Art Unit 2453
5/5/09